

former competitors and coaches. It is a rare Department of Speech which does not contain at least one faculty member who has not had some participation or coaching experience. It is also interesting to note that these former competitors go on to successful careers outside of our discipline. Well over 50 percent of the names of men listed in Ewbank's *Who's Who In America* had some debate experience. (Rohrer, 1979) Findings such as these indicate that debate and forensics are valuable activities in the training of our future leaders, both in the discipline and in the total society. The goals of forensics, which are very similar to those of the Speech Communication discipline, significantly influence these results.

Coincidental Goals

For many years, the primary value of debate and public speaking activities was thought to be the training of individuals to speak before a group. But in the process, many students seemed to be learning important skills in organizing, researching, and other matters related to effective communication. In fact, this author believes that the general goals of education and (by association) our discipline are being met consistently and effectively by forensics activities.

It might seem that little would be accomplished from a listing of goals for forensics programs which was no more than the general goals of all formal education. Such ends as (1) clear and rational thinking, (2) the ability to utilize effectively the library and other research facilities, (3) the capacity to engage in intensive intellectual activity, (4) the ability to avoid uncritical acceptance of ideas, (5) social adjustment, (6) the commitment to ethical behavior, (7) the effective use of language whether written or oral, (8) the ability to organize and synthesize diverse bits of information into a meaningful whole, and so forth, are considered to be the objects of virtually all formal education. Nevertheless, teachers in forensics have come to believe . . . that most of

these goals are realistically within the scope of forensics. (Rieke, 1968, pp. 55-56)

Recently Matson (1979) studied the goals and impacts of individual events activities and found very similar results. Thus, the goals and objectives of forensics activities seem to be closely tied to those of education in general and the discipline of Speech Communication specifically. But I think it is imperative that we recognize another valuable effect of forensics programs.

It would be foolish to address the issues relevant to forensics and our discipline without a discussion of the socio-emotional values of these activities. Few, if any, teachers in our ranks would contend that academic scholarship is the only (or even primary) *educational* benefit of a college degree. Rather, most of us recognize the advantages of the social, psychological, and emotional relationships which develop during an individual's college career. It seems that forensics is somewhat unique in offering students these sorts of rewards. Thomas (1979) argued that a "powerful personal motivation for students to engage in forensics activities seems to be existential" (p. 1). He goes on to outline the typical scenario of the forensics students working long hours in preparing for a tournament; forsaking weekend fun in order to travel sometimes long hours in a crowded car, with no guarantee of "success"; and, working closely with a coach and other team members to form a "community" feeling on the team. These behaviors are rarely seen in any other educational settings, especially in regular college classes.

Perhaps the most significant personal effect of forensics participation is the close relationship which frequently develops between a coach and his/her students. This sort of relationship rarely develops through the classroom experience, but is a valuable aspect of the educational process. It allows the student to go beyond the "traditional" aspects of learning from lectures, readings, and the like. Often it helps the student better understand the coaches' motivations,

and his/her enthusiasm for the discipline. Naturally, then, the students are more interested in taking Speech classes and learning the theoretical reasons for their forensics successes. Many of these students go on to become majors or minors in Speech, and some even become coaches themselves. It is not unusual that, as Rieke (1968) wrote, "the student in forensics tends to complain when he does not have enough practice, attention, competition, or opportunity for research" (p. 58). Therefore, it would seem to be in our interest, as members of the Speech Communication discipline, to (1) encourage forensics programs, so as to attract these students to our discipline, and (2) to encourage our forensics competitors to enroll in our courses and to major in the field. In so doing, we can attract and interest the very best students available. In times of economic uncertainty, this objective would seem to be an important one for our future.

Future Considerations

In writing about the underlying basis of support for forensics programs, Rieke (1968) cautioned that, "Too frequently, subjects and activities in education are retained not because they reflect a clearly articulated philosophy, but because they have existed in the past and still seem to be the right thing to do" (p. 33). Unfortunately, we have been guilty of assuming that our programs will not be cut even though our philosophies are vague, ambiguous, or simply unspoken. We can no longer make that assumption. We must begin to re-evaluate forensics as an academic and educational tool in an effort to ensure that it continues to meet the afore-mentioned goals which Rieke outlined. As we observe the status quo it is not too difficult to find critics, detractors, and skeptics within our discipline. As mentioned above, forensics is coming under its most serious challenge yet; the challenge of diminishing revenues. As the pressures mount and as the critics increase, it is up to those of us in forensics education to answer this challenge and to reassert our role within the discipline. Yet, as we attempt to answer our critics and meet

these challenges, we seem to ignore the very principles we teach. It is indeed ironic that we frequently take a defensive posture when we are asked to justify the existence of a forensics program. Rarely do we experience similar attacks on the theatre program or the music program at our schools. It seems that at the same time we are encouraging our students to analyze their audiences and alter their messages, we back ourselves into a corner by attempting to justify our programs in "quantifiable" ways. That is, rather than accentuating our *unique* benefits to the educational process, we fall victim to "apologia" and defend ourselves from half-truths, myths, and misinformation. Two examples follow.

One frequently heard criticism of academic debate is that it is "unrealistic" in its application. Critics argue that "audience" debating is more "real-life" in the application of argumentative principles. They go on to contend that four people arguing their case to a single judge is an exercise in academic masterbation. Yet what do we offer as a defense? The rebuttal goes something like this: "When was the last time you saw a 'real-life' audience debate? The Carter-Reagan debates? Should we encourage audience debating because our students might grow up to run for President some day? Who wins 'audience debates' anyway? Well, our research shows us it's the most attractive rhetor, not the one with the best argument." An example of this defense comes from Mills (1960), "Before anyone dichotomizes tournament debating and audience debating and declares that only the latter is realistic, he should face the facts that many important debates in real life are not presented to an audience in the popular sense, and that the rival advocates do compete for decisions" (p. 96).

Another criticism is that far too few students benefit from the money spent on supporting a forensics program. The responses here vary somewhat but usually focus on the "quantifiable" aspects of forensics such as "trophies won", "rival schools defeated", and such cost/benefit

analysis as student hours invested vs. cost per dollar, miles traveled vs. students hours in preparation, or a comparison of outlays per student as compared with football teams at the school. In short it's the "we're just as viable as 'they' are" argument.

The obvious problem with both of these approaches is that they are doomed to failure. They might be appropriate in the short run, but unless the program has a strong philosophical base they will fall on deaf ears sooner or later. As soon as we accept the *premise* that the critics offer, that *we* must prove our programs' educational utility, we can not hope to "win." If we allow our critics to set the ground rules and dictate "definitions", then we have begun the self-defeating process of changing our program's philosophy from "educational" to "efficient."

But what can be done in the future to not only answer our critics, but to obtain a more viable base within the discipline of Speech Communication? In attempting to answer this question, I was amazed to learn that it had been specifically addressed nine years ago, at the 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics, held in Sedalia, Colorado. McBeth (1975) reported that, "a key conference recommendation was to shift from thinking of forensics as an activity to regarding forensics as a perspective for education and scholarship in communication" (p. 367). But nine years later there are few programs which have done this. Most tournaments which sponsor "Rhetorical Criticism" or "Communication Analysis" have trouble getting large numbers of students to enter. Yet here is, perhaps, the most closely tied event to research in our discipline. Programs have been sponsored at regional and national conventions which have sought to "standardize" rules across all tournaments. Is "real-life" standardized? Debate rules have long been standardized, but most debate coaches will admit that if the rules changed at every tournament the students would rebel and drop out. Are we thus caught "on the horns of a delimma"? Do we have to

"trade-off" educational benefits for student participation?

There are some hopeful signs that the educators in forensics are not willing to let the activity go down the proverbial drain. The increasing number of panels and competitive papers at the national and regional conventions; the development of a semi-annual journal by the National Forensics Association; the organization of a Pre-Convention Workshop by Pi Kappa Delta, before their Bi-Annual Conventions; the Summer Forensics Workshop of Pi Kappa Delta; the Summer Conferences on Argumentation; and the change in emphasis of *The Forensic* to more research articles are all examples that the Sedalia recommendations may be more fully acknowledged in the future. As such. I would argue that the following three suggestions can also help to establish the viability and legitimacy of an individual program.

Recommendation 1: Forensics directors should seek and encourage policy statements by their departments as to the academic, educational, and career oriented objectives of the program. In other words, forensics should be an "arm" or application of what the departmental goals are attempting to do. If this means that the department wishes the students to acquire more practical skills in public speaking, then perhaps the interpretation festival schedule will have to be scrapped. If students thus abandon the program, it seems clear that their goals are at odds with the department's.

Recommendation 2: I believe it is critical for forensics programs and Departments of Speech to keep close and accurate records as to the graduates of their programs. This would serve to "quantify" (for those who need it) the practical benefits which were gained during the student's years at the college/university. There may not be a direct relationship between forensics participation and success in life, but I am very proud of the accomplishments

of my former students and their continuing involvement in the discipline. Three of them are currently in the process of completing their Ph. D.'s in the field. I never hesitate to use such "evidence" before departmental committees, deans, and budget reviewers. Trophies soon tarnish and get dusty, while successful alumni serve as examples of a college's quality.

Recommendation 3: We, as decision makers in forensics, should continually seek new ways of adapting our activities to the realities of the world. This is not to say we should change debate, or add numerous new individual events. Rather, we should encourage our debaters to continually seek new ways of debating - not just new "blocs", to work on new cases, and to explore issues, not as Sophists, but as critical individuals in the public spectrum. Tournaments such as the Protagerous Tournaments and the Decision - Making Tournaments should be encouraged. Give students an opportunity to use their skills in new ways and they will grow. In I.E. we should encourage our students to continually look for new topic areas, interp. selections, and new events to enter. We should sponsor events such as Salesmanship and Rhetorical Criticism in order to allow students to apply their academic knowledge in practical ways. Perhaps new students, from our classes, will be attracted in the process. We should experiment with new approaches to these events. An exciting idea was tried a few years ago at Kent State University. Students arrived on Friday, viewed a video taped speech, received a manuscript of the speech, and then had to develop, research, and write a Rhetorical Criticism to be delivered on Saturday. Also, Impromptu Sales, which is frequently offered at Shippenburg's tournament (and others in the East), is one which forces the student to have an understanding of the skills necessary in sales

in order to apply them to potentially any product. On the other hand, efforts such as the "Great Eastern" tournaments should be discouraged since it reinforces the notion that learning is result of doing the same speech over and over again, with the same rules - as long as it's winning.

These suggestions will not answer all of our critics, nor will they guarantee that a close relationship between forensics and the Department of Speech will exist. But with actions such as these, we will move through the 1980's with a more clearly defined set of goals, a better understanding of the role of forensics in the educational process, and a more effective channel of communication between the forensics team and the oversight of the department.

Finally, I think it is important to remember that we will only be as effective or successful as our training has made us. We are all the product of some sort of forensics training, and as such, carry a legacy for our students. Whether we go on to coach forensics for many years or say goodbye to it after graduation, we can make it work for the students who follow us, or we can watch it decay and die. I've already mentioned many people who got where they did, in part, because of their training in forensics. Can we, as a discipline, take the chance that they would have been a part of our field without forensics? Are we ready to risk future scholars, researchers, and teachers because we think debaters talk too fast? Or because it costs alot of money to travel to a tournament? How we answer these questions may well fortell the fate of forensics and our discipline in the generations to come.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J.M. Argumentation and education. *Proceedings: National Conference on Argumentation*. Texas Christian University, 1973.

Colburn, C.W. *Strategies for Educational Debate*. Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972.

Derryberry, B. Forensics programs in a scrutinizing decade. *The Forensic*, March

1980, 25, 4-5.

Matson, R. An inventory of the perceived educational objectives of individual events by college directors of forensics. Paper presented to the Central States Speech Convention, April, 1979.

McBath, J.H. Future directions for forensics education. *The Speech Teacher*, November, 1975, 365-369.

Rieke, R.D. A philosophy of forensics. In

Directing Forensics: Debate and Contest Speaking. Eds. D.F. Foules and R.D. Rieke. Scranton, PA: International Textbook Co., 1968.

Rohrer, D.M. Debate as a liberal art. In *Advanced Debate*. Ed. D. Thomas. Skokie: National Textbook Co., 1979. 3-11.

Thomas, D. Ed. *Advanced Debate*, Skokie: NTC, 1979.

Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament Rules *YMCA of the Rockies* *April 13-16, 1983*

GENERAL:

1.) Each student and one faculty director of forensics from each college attending the convention must pay the \$30.00 registration fee. However, if entries are postmarked on or before March 10, 1983 this fee will be reduced to \$25.00 each. The fee for each extra judge and guest is \$5.00.

2.) Each student delegate to the convention and each participant in the tournament must be a bona fide undergraduate student who has not already had four years of forensic participation and who is carrying a minimum of twelve hours of college work with passing grades at the time of the convention. He must be a member of Pi Kappa Delta or must have filed a membership application with the National Secretary and sent in his initiation fee.

3.) All tournament entries must be sent to the Tournament Director (Penny Swisher) so as to show a postmark not later than March 16, 1983. A school cancelling or dropping entries after 12:00 noon (Central Standard Time), April 8, 1983, will be obligated for April 8 full fees. A school cancelling or dropping entries after 12:00 noon (Central Standard Time), April 1, 1983, but before 12:00 noon (Central Standard Time), April 8, 1983, will be obligated for one-half fees.

4.) All questions regarding tournament events not covered by the rules will be decided by the specific contest committee and the Contest Chairman. Questions concerning interpretation of tournament

rules should be directed to Penny Swisher, Department of Communication, William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri 64068, Work Phone: (816) 781-3806.

JUDGES:

1.) All competing chapters must provide competent judges for debate (if they enter) and for individual events (if they enter). One debate judge can judge for one or two debate entries. One IE judge can judge for one or two debate entries. One IE judge can judge for up to ten slots in IE. A qualified judge can serve for both:

- (a) Two debate teams and two IE slots, or
- (b) One debate team and six IE slots.

YOU MUST MEET THE TOTAL JUDGE REQUIREMENT FOR ALL YOUR ENTRIES.

2.) Qualifications: All judges must be college graduates with sufficient training in competitive forensics to suspend personal judgement on issues and judge on the basis of the quality of each student's performance.

(a) Coaches

(1) For debate judges, each judge should have judged at least ten rounds of inter-collegiate debate competition during the current year.

(2) For IE judges, each judge should have judged IE in competition at two tournaments during the current year.

(b) Guest Judges

Pi Kappa Delta will utilize judges who are not currently active but have had sufficient experience in forensics in the past to meet

the criteria. These persons will be guest judges and will serve to remind all participants of their obligation to make themselves understood to the well-informed general public, not just a small in-group of specialists. Debate teams may be judged by guest judges in not more than two rounds of competition. IE participants will not have more than one of their two judges in a round selected from guest judges. Guest judges will be used only in contests they are qualified by experience to judge.

(c) No undergraduate student may serve as a judge.

3.) Assignments: All judges are to be available to judge up to twelve rounds regardless of the size of their entry.

AWARDS:

1.) Gold medals and certificates will be awarded to winners of superior ratings in each event. Certificates will be awarded to winners of excellent ratings. Certificates will be awarded to the school for each student who received a rating of superior or excellent.

2.) Sweepstakes points will be awarded to each chapter participating according to the following formula:

In Debate

Superior rating	10 points
Excellent	8 points
Good	6 points
Participation	2 points

In Individual Events

Superior rating	5 points
Excellent	4 points
Good	3 points
Participation	1 point*

*Each school may earn a maximum of one participation point in each individual event they enter without earning a rating. Each school may earn a maximum of two participation points in each division of debate if they earn no ratings in that division. More than one entry from a school may earn a superior, excellent, or good rating, but participation points are awarded only in events where no contestant achieves a higher rating.

3.) Superior sweepstakes awards will be made to the 10 percent of the chapters accumulating the highest number of sweepstakes points. Excellent sweepstakes awards will be made to the 20 percent of the chapters ranking next in number of sweepstakes points.

DEBATE GENERAL

DIVISIONS:

1.) There will be four divisions: Championship, Traditional, Lincoln-Douglas (one person), and CEDA.

ENTRIES:

1.) Each chapter may enter a maximum of two debate teams in each division of this tournament.

2.) Experience and expertise are criteria for entering the Championship Division. In this division each member of the team entered should have won 50 percent of all tournament debates during the 1982-1983 season, with a minimum of twenty rounds of competition.

3.) Substitutions may be made in the Traditional Division only. NO substitutions may be made in the Lincoln-Douglas (one-person), Championship, or CEDA Divisions.

ROUNDS:

1.) There will be eight rounds for all teams. In the Championship and CEDA Divisions two teams will participate in a final ninth round.

2.) Each team entered will participate in an equal number of affirmative and negative rounds.

3.) Each team will be allowed preparation time between speeches not to exceed eight minutes total. Any additional preparation time will be deducted from speaking time. Debaters are encouraged to use less preparation time when feasible.

JUDGES:

1.) For all rounds except the elimination rounds in the Championship and CEDA Division one judge will be used.

- 2.) Judges may make comments to debaters but will not reveal decisions.
- 3.) Debate teams may be judged by guest judges in not more than two of their eight rounds. Guest judges will be experienced in debate but not active on the specific topic this year.

AWARDS:

- 1.) Superior ratings will be awarded to the top 10 percent of the teams in each division.
- 2.) Excellent ratings will be awarded to the next 20 percent.
- 3.) Good ratings will be awarded to the next 30 percent. Win-loss records will be used as the first criterion for award determination; ties will be broken by employing team ratings.

SCHEDULING:

- 1.) Teams will not meet teams from their own province, or their own state, or be judged by judges from their state or province (elimination rounds in Championship and CEDA Divisions exempt from this requirement). Guest judges from the Colorado area may judge nearby teams if there is no affiliation.

SPECIFIC

ON TOPIC DEBATE [*Championship and Traditional*]:

- 1.) Subject: Resolved: That all United States military intervention into the internal affairs of any foreign nation or nations in the Western Hemisphere should be prohibited.

CHAMPIONSHIP AND CEDA DEBATE:

- 1.) SCHEDULING: In these divisions scheduling will follow the general form outlined above under "General Debate Rules" up to and including the sixth round. In the seventh round hidden quarterfinals will be held. In the eighth round hidden semi-finals will be held. In this manner each team participating will debate eight rounds with the finalists not announced until after eight rounds have been completed. A final round (ninth) will be held between the two winners

- of the semifinal round.
- 2.) FORMAT: A cross-examination style of debate will be observed in these divisions. The debaters will decide which affirmative speakers will question the negative speakers and which negative speakers will question the affirmative speakers but each participant will question and be questioned. Time limits for speeches will be:

First affirm. constructive	8 min.
Cross-exam by neg.	3 min.
First neg. constructive	8 min.
Cross-exam by affirm	3 min.
Second affirm. constructive	8 min.
Cross-exam by neg.	3 min.
Second neg. constructive	8 min.
Cross-exam by affirm	3 min.
First neg. rebuttal	4 min.
First affirm. rebuttal	4 min.
Second neg. rebuttal	4 min.
Second affirm. rebuttal	4 min.

- 3.) The CEDA topic for the second semester will be utilized for this Division.

TRADITIONAL DEBATE:

- 1.) FORMAT: The traditional 10-5 format will be used.

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS (ONE-PERSON) DEBATE:

- 1.) SUBJECTS: One topic will be used: "Resolved: that the United States should adopt a constitutional ammendment requiring a balanced federal budget."

2.) FORMAT:	
Affirm. constructive	6 min.
Cross-exam by neg.	3 min.
Neg. constructive	7 min.
Cross-exam by affirm	3 min.
Affirm. rebuttal	4 min.
Neg. rebuttal	6 min.
Affirm. rebuttal	3 min.

(NOTE THAT TWO LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATES ARE SCHEDULED FOR 1 1/2 HOUR TIME SLOTS.)

INDIVIDUAL EVENTS
GENERAL

ENTRIES:

- 1.) Each chapter may enter three contest-

ants in each event.

2.) Contestants must be present at the beginning of each round (except in extemporaneous and impromptu speaking: see specific rules) and should remain until the round has been concluded. This rule precludes scheduling individual contestants in events that are held simultaneously.

3.) No participant may utilize the same presentation in more than one event.

4.) A manuscript or an outline, whichever is used by the speaker, in all prepared events must be available in each round and available to the tournament committee upon request.

5.) Failure to meet either the general rules or the rules specified below for each event will result in a contestant's being ineligible for any final rating.

6.) Judges will provide time signals to contestants. Time cards will be available for those who wish to use them.

ROUNDS:

1.) There will be three rounds of competition in each event. Each contestant must participate in all rounds to receive a final rating.

2.) All sections of each event will be scheduled simultaneously according to the published convention schedule. The number of sections will be determined by the number of contestants entered in each event.

JUDGING:

1.) Judging for oratory, impromptu, extemporaneous speaking, informative speaking, rhetorical criticism, dramatic interpretation, speaking to entertain, dramatic duo, and oral interpretation of prose and poetry will be done by two judges in each section in each round. The judges will rank only the four highest ranking speakers, indicating first, second, third, and fourth place. All others in each section will be ranked fifth. Judges will include written comments on the ballot. Judges will not reveal rankings or decisions to the contestants.

2.) Specific rules for judging discussants are listed under the specific rules for Discussion.

AWARDS:

1.) Superior ratings will be awarded to the top 10 percent of contestants in each event.

2.) Excellent ratings will be awarded to the next 20 percent.

3.) Good ratings will be awarded to the next 30 percent.

ORATORY:

1.) Orations must not exceed ten minutes in length and shall contain not more than 150 words of quoted material exclusive of direct discourse, dialogue, or other stylistic devices created by the speaker. The oration must be delivered without notes or manuscript.

2.) Orations should be the original work of the contestants and should be designed to convince, inspire, and/or motivate.

EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING:

1.) The general area will be: "America in the 80's". Subtopics for each round shall be: Round I - "International Problems and Policies"

Round II - "National Problems and Policies"

Round III - "Social and Cultural Values and Styles"

Specific topics for each round will be drawn by the Contest Committee.

2.) Speeches must not exceed seven minutes in length.

3.) Topics for extemporaneous speeches will be posted in a designated room at five minute intervals. Speakers will choose from posted topics and must speak in the order in which they draw. Speakers will report to their assigned sections one-half hour after drawing.

ORAL INTERPRETATION OF PROSE:

1.) The program of each contestant for each round must not exceed ten minutes, including material read from a prepared manuscript, an extemporaneous introduction, and transitions.

- 2.) The content of each program may include more than one selection with the arrangement centered on an integrated theme. The material must be taken from published literature of quality. Plays are prohibited.
- 3.) Contestants are to place primary emphasis on the vocal aspects of interpretation and to keep overt physical manifestations to a minimum.

ORAL INTERPRETATION OF POETRY:

Same rules as oral interpretation of prose.

DRAMATIC DUO:

- 1.) A cutting (scene) from a play, humorous or serious, involving the portrayal of two characters presented by two individuals. This is not an acting event. Thus, no costumes, props, lighting, etc., are to be used.
- 2.) Presentation is from the manuscript and the focus should be off-stage and not to each other. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes.

INFORMATIVE SPEAKING:

- 1.) Informative speeches should be essentially non-persuasive, dealing with concepts, processes, ideas, or objects.
- 2.) Audio-visual aids may be used but are not required. The tournament management cannot be responsible for supplying equipment or special facilities.
- 3.) The speech may be memorized or delivered extemporaneously. It may be delivered with or without notes, but not more than ten minutes will be allotted each speaker.
- 4.) The speech shall be the original production of the speaker and shall not have been delivered prior to the current school year.

SPEAKING TO ENTERTAIN:

- 1.) Speeches to entertain should be designed primarily for audience enjoyment. They should be thematically unified, in good taste, and develop a significant point.
- 2.) The speech may be memorized or delivered extemporaneously. It may be delivered with or without notes, but no more

than ten minutes will be allotted each speaker.

- 3.) The speech shall be the original production of the speaker and shall not have been delivered prior to the current school year.

IMPROMPTU:

- 1.) Maximum time of seven minutes of which at least three minutes must be speaking time.
- 2.) All contestants will be given the same three topic choices in each round; therefore, contestants must wait outside the room until their turn to draw.
- 3.) Topics will be developed to conform to the following areas:
Round I - "Attack or Defend"
Round II - "Creative" (Pictures, Cartoons, or Objects)
Round III - "Philosophical Quotation"

DISCUSSION:

- 1.) The national Discussion topic will be utilized. "What policy should the United States pursue in regard to genetic research?"
- 2.) Each contestant will participate in the same group all three rounds. Each group should follow the decision-making process. Criteria for judging will be based on the following:
Round I - a. define and analyze the problem; b. set up criteria
Round II - a. solution
Round III - a. continue discussion of solution; b. select best solution
c. actuate
- 3.) Each group will have a resident judge (same all 3 rounds) and a visiting judge evaluate each round.
- 4.) Schools having students who are qualified or willing to serve as chairpersons should put an asterisk by the individual's name. Otherwise, the tournament director will arbitrarily assign chairpersons.

RHETORICAL CRITICISM:

- 1.) The rhetorical criticism is an original critical analysis of any speech rhetorical

artifact or group of speeches actually delivered by one or more speakers to an audience.

- 2.) The contestant should limit quotation from, or summary or paraphrase of, the analyzed material to a minimum. Attention should be given not only to analyze (explaining why and how the event is significant) but also to evaluation (appraising the success or failure of the event).
- 3.) The criticism may be delivered with

notes (no manuscripts), but no more than ten minutes will be allotted each speaker.

DRAMATIC INTERPRETATION:

- 1.) A cutting from a published play (or plays) of literary merit is to be used in Dramatic Interpretation.
- 2.) Use of a manuscript is required.
- 3.) Maximum time limit is ten minutes, including introduction.

Pi Kappa Delta National Convention and Tournament *YMCA of the Rockies — April 13-16, 1983* *Schedule of Events*

Wednesday, April 13th

* *Lunch will be served every day from 11:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.*

8:00 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.	Registration - Longhouse
1:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Pre-convention Program
6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.	Meeting of Province Governors (Dinner) and Student Lt. Governors
7:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.	Province Meetings
8:00 p.m. - Adjournment	First Business Session of the Convention - WGR Auditorium
9:30 p.m.	Coaches Reception - Womens Bldg

Thursday, April 14th

7:30 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.	Breakfast (Students meet Council)
8:30 a.m. -	Draw for Extemp (Longhouse)
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	Extemp I; Poetry I
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Informative I; Impromptu I
12:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Championship, Traditional, and C.E.D.A. Debate I; Lincoln-Douglas Debate I and II; Dramatic Duo I; Discussion I; Rhetorical Criticism I
1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Oratory I; Prose I
3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.	Championship, Traditional, and C.E.D.A. Debate II; Entertain I; Dramatic Interpretation I
4:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.	Championship, Traditional, and C.E.D.A. Debate III; Discussion II; Rhetorical Criticism II
6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.	Dinner (Student Lt. Governors dine with National Council)
7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.	Second Business Session of the Convention - Elect Officers, WGR Auditorium
9:00 p.m. -	Dance - Longhouse
9:00 p.m. -	Past Presidents, Past Council and Governors Reception - Womens Building

Friday, April 15th

7:30 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.	Breakfast and Student's Meeting
8:30 a.m. -	Draw for Extemp -Longhouse
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	Extemp II; Poetry II